

- Rice, S.A. 1991. Reproductive isolation in the *Polydora ligni* complex and the *Streblospio benedicti* complex (Polychaeta: Spionidae). *Bulletin of Marine Science*, **48**: 432–447.
- Williams, J.D. & Radashevsky, V.I. 1999. Morphology, ecology, and reproduction of a new *Polydora* species from the east coast of North America (Polychaeta: Spionidae). *Ophelia*, **51**(2): 115–127.

(2) Mary E. Petersen

Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15,
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

I strongly urge that the proposed conservation of the specific name of the polychaetous annelid *Polydora websteri* Hartman in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (SPIONIDAE) and designation of a lectotype for this species be supported.

The application by Radashevsky & Williams (BZN 55: 212–216) is clearly presented and well argued. It requests conservation of the specific name *websteri* for the species seen and described by Hartman (1943), and not for the distinct species (*P. caeca* Webster, 1879) for which Hartman intended it to be a new replacement name (nomen novum) because of homonymy with the older *Leucodorum coecum* Örsted, 1843 (currently *Dipolydora coeca*).

As pointed out by Radashevsky & Williams, the species described by Hartman is well known and widely distributed, whereas the species seen and described by Webster (1879) has until recently not been recognized. The authors mention (paras. 6 and 10) only two known finds of the species since it was described: material of S.H. Hopkins from off Virginia (the type locality of *P. caeca*), and more recently live material from Rhode Island.

Hartman's original material of *Polydora websteri* is extant, and a proposed lectotype, in agreement with Hartman's description and also with that of others who have used the name, has been selected and redescribed by Radashevsky (1999).

Williams & Radashevsky (1999) have also provided a careful and detailed description of a new nominal species, *P. neocaeca* Williams & Radashevsky, 1999 based on material from Rhode Island, and very clearly indicated that their material fits the description of *P. caeca* from Virginia by Webster. This acknowledges that two taxonomic species are involved and promotes stability in maintaining the present usage and type locality of *P. websteri*.

The proposals made by Radashevsky and Williams in their application are well considered and I suggest that supporting their application will promote the greatest nomenclatural stability.

Comment on the proposed designation of *Cuma rathkii* Kroyer, 1841 as the type species of *Diastylis* Say, 1818 (Crustacea, Cumacea)
(Case 3078; see BZN 56: 174–176)

L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands

Dr Gerken's application is most welcome and actually long overdue. The unfortunate fact that *Diastylis* has a type species of doubtful identity has been known

for a long time. It was mentioned by Zimmer (1940, pp. 1–2) and Day (1980, pp. 221, 264), while Băcescu (1992, pp. 274, 277) extensively discussed the matter and explained two possible solutions: (1) the fixation of a neotype for *Diastylis arenarius*, the type species of the genus, or (2) the fixation of a different type species. Day and Băcescu agreed that if the second course were followed the most suitable type species would be *Cuma rathkii* Krøyer, 1841, and we must be grateful to Dr Gerken for proposing that the Commission should designate this species. I wholeheartedly agree with her action, though I have a few remarks on minor points of detail.

In para. 1 Dr Gerken says that *Diastylis arenarius* was the only species included in the genus and is therefore the type species by monotypy. However, after describing *D. arenarius* Say (1818, p. 315) noted 'I think there is little doubt of this animal being congeneric with *Cancer scorpioides*, described by Montagu' and on p. 316 he continued '*Cancer esca* Gmel. ... will ... form a third species of this genus'. As mentioned in para. 3 of the application, Montagu's species is now placed in *Bodotria* and *Gammarus esca* Fabricius, 1779 is unidentifiable. The first fixation of a type species known to me was by Fowler (1912, p. 534) who cited *D. arenarius* in the belief that the genus was originally monotypic.

The 'type locality' mentioned in Dr Gerken's para. 5 actually consists of two widely separated localities: Hornbaek (Denmark) in the Kattegat and southern Greenland. As the type material in Copenhagen consists of several specimens from these two localities it would be advisable to select a lectotype for *Cuma rathkii* in case the existing syntypes are found to represent more than one taxon.

Additional reference

Fowler, H.W. 1912. The Crustacea of New Jersey. *Report of the State Museum of New Jersey*, 1911: 29–650, pls. 1–150.

Comment on the proposed precedence of NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, [1845] over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)
(Case 3048; see BZN 56: 31–33)

Wolfgang Speidel and Wolfram Mey

Museum für Naturkunde, Institut für Systematische Zoologie, Humboldt-Universität, Invalidenstr. 43, D-10115 Berlin, Germany

In the past the crambid species concerned in this case were generally referred to as the NYMPHULINAE. The single species *Acentria ephemerella* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775 was placed in a separate subfamily on its own; *Acentria ephemerella* is a senior subjective synonym of both *Phryganea nivea* Olivier, 1791, the type species of *Acentria* Stephens, 1829, and of *Acentropus garnonsii* Curtis, 1834, the type species by original designation of *Acentropus* Curtis, 1834. The latter nominal genus is the basis of the subfamily ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835; under the provisions of the Code (Article 40.1 of the 1999 Edition) ACENTROPINAE is a potentially valid name even though *Acentropus* is invalid because it is a junior synonym of *Acentria*.

Acentria ephemerella was placed by one of us (Speidel, 1981) in the same subfamily as the species which were classified in the NYMPHULINAE; this resulted in the synonymisation of ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835 and NYMPHULINAE Duponchel,

[1845] and it was necessary to decide which of these names should be used. Speidel (1981) chose ACENTROPINAE on simple priority, though the name NYMPHULINAE is of course well established and widely known for the aquatic crambid moths. NYMPHULINAE has been used often in the past 20 years (probably in more than the 72 papers mentioned in para. 3 of the application), but the synonymy of ACENTROPINAE and NYMPHULINAE has rarely been mentioned and, contrary to para. 3 of the application, the deliberate giving of precedence to the latter name has not been evident. The ACENTROPINAE s.l. are a subfamily of the microlepidopterous family CRAMBIDAE with only a very few specialists working on it, and it is not surprising that most references citing ACENTROPINAE as senior synonym of NYMPHULINAE are by Speidel and his colleagues.

As mentioned above, the subfamily ACENTROPINAE was often cited as valid before 1981, with *Acentria ephemerella* as the only included species. This species has a very restricted distribution; it is found in Europe with only a few records from North America. It is therefore not surprising that most non-European authors are not familiar with the ACENTROPINAE s.str. and indeed hardly have reason to mention it. According to para. 4 of the application, ACENTROPINAE has been used in the wider sense only by Gomez Bustillo (1983) and by Speidel and his co-author Roesler (Roesler & Speidel, 1981). This is not correct: there have been other papers (Bassi, Passerin D'Entrèves, Speidel & Zangheri, 1995; Mey, Nuss & Speidel, 1998), and it makes no difference that Speidel was a co-author (e.g., the systematic section on ACENTROPINAE in Bassi et al. (1995) was written by Bassi alone). There have also been papers (Hasenfuss, 1991; Yamanaka, 1998) accepting the senior synonym ACENTROPINAE where Speidel was not involved. For the record, we mention two recent papers by Speidel (1998a; 1998b).

It is not quite true (cf. para. 3 of the application) that the synonymy of ACENTROPINAE and NYMPHULINAE has been 'generally accepted' since 1981. Two important authors (Munroe, 1983; Yoshiyasu, 1985) did not do so, and we can find no indication that Inoue (1982) or Munroe (1995) did, since the name ACENTROPINAE is not mentioned at all in those papers. Palm (1996) described the synonymy as 'omstridt' [arguable]. Of the papers cited in the application, only Minet (1982) and Shaffer, Nielsen & Horak (1996) accepted the synonymy and explicitly favoured giving precedence to NYMPHULINAE.

It is not possible to give an exact number of genera which share the larval and pupal autapomorphies of the ACENTROPINAE (s.l.). It is uncertain whether several tropical genera belong to the subfamily because the immature stages are unknown. The present (unpublished) list includes about 45 genera worldwide, about 20 generic names presently regarded as junior synonyms and 5 generic homonyms. The number of 93 genera according to Fletcher & Nye (1984) cited in the application is probably due to the fact that the MUSOTIMINAE were included and/or that the generic synonyms were separately counted.

Progress in phylogenetic research is always accompanied by changes in taxonomy and nomenclature. Acceptance of the proposals by Solis in Case 3048 would provide an argument for any future proposal to abandon the principle of priority of synonymous supraspecific names. The discussion of characters supporting or falsifying synonymisations must not be unnecessarily complicated by a discussion about the names. We would support the suppression of ACENTROPINAE if this were an

old and forgotten name which had been dug out, but this is not the case and we therefore oppose the application.

Acknowledgement

We thank our colleague Jason Dunlop (Berlin) for linguistic corrections of the English text.

Additional references

- Bassi, G., Passerin D'Entrèves, P., Speidel, W. & Zangheri, S. 1995. Lepidoptera Pyraloidea. In Minelli, A., Ruffo, S. & La Posta, S. (Eds.), *Checklist delle specie della fauna italiana*, vol. 87. 28 pp. Calderini, Bologna.
- Hasenfuss, I. 1991. Evolution der aquatischen Larven und Puppen der Acentropinae (=Nymphulinae/Crambidae/Pyraloidea/Lepid.). *Verhandlungen der deutschen zoologischen Gesellschaft*, 84: 444.
- Mey, W., Nuss, M. & Speidel, W. 1998. Data about Lepidoptera diversity in the Afromontane Region of Malawi (Insecta, Microlepidoptera and Heterocera). *Mémoires de la Société Royale Belge d'Entomologie*, 38: 155–170.
- Munroe, E. 1983. Pyralidae (except Crambinae). Pp. 67–85 in Hodges, R.W. et al. (Eds.), *Check List of the Lepidoptera of America north of Mexico*. xxiv, 284 pp. London.
- Speidel, W. 1998a. The genus *Eoophyla* Swinhoe, 1900 from the Philippine Islands (Lep., Crambidae, Acentropinae). *Nachrichten des entomologischen Vereins Apollo*, Supplementum 17 (Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Insekten der Philippinen iii): 465–474.
- Speidel, W. 1998b. The genus *Nymphicula* Snellen, 1880 in the Philippines (Lepidoptera: Crambidae: Acentropinae). *Esperiana*, 6: 533–546, pl. U.
- Yamanaka, H. 1998. Pyralidae of Nepal (ii). Pp. 99–114 in Haruta, T. (Ed.), *Moths of Nepal*, part 5. *Tinea* (Tokyo), 15 (Supplement 1). xvi, 314 pp., 31 pls.
- Yoshiyasu, Y. 1985. A systematic study of the Nymphulinae and the Musotiminae of Japan (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Scientific Reports of the Kyoto Prefectural University (Agriculture)*, 37: 1–162.

Comment on the conservation of usage of the specific names of *Scaptodrosophila rufifrons* (Loew, 1873) and *S. lebanonensis* (Wheeler, 1949) by the designation of a neotype for *S. rufifrons* (Insecta, Diptera)
(Case 3128; see BZN 56: 179–181)

V. Sidorenko

Laboratory of Entomology, Institute of Biology and Soil Sciences, Far Eastern Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok 69022, Russia

The history and taxonomy of the species concerned and the purpose of Dr Bächli's proposal have been discussed not only in the published application but also in the recent revision of the *S. rufifrons* species-group by Papp, Rácz & Bächli (1999), which includes a description and figures of the neotype. In my opinion this application is completely satisfactory and I support it.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Solenopsis invicta* Buren, 1972 (Insecta, Hymenoptera)
(Case 3069; see BZN 56: 27–30, 198–199)

Sanford D. Porter

Center for Medical, Agricultural and Veterinary Entomology, USDA-ARS, P.O. Box 14565, Gainesville, Florida 32604, U.S.A.